

1
2 Q: What is the subject of your testimony?
3

4 Ans: I wish to express my continuing concerns about the project's potential public
5 health impacts in light of the project revisions proposed.
6

7 Q: What materials have you reviewed in preparation of your testimony?
8

9 Ans: I have reviewed those portions of the revised application pertaining to air quality
10 impacts, with a focus on that information addressing particulate matter. I have
11 also reviewed the prefiled testimony of Sanya Petrovic.
12

13 Q: Have the revisions to the project eliminated your previously stated concerns?
14

15 Ans: While the PM 2.5 emissions are lower, my previously expressed concerns remain.
16

17 Q: Do you agree with Ms. Petrovic's conclusion that as modified the SE2 generation
18 plant will have no adverse public health impacts?
19

20 Ans: No.
21

22 Q: Why?
23

24 Ans: In reading her testimony she indicates that an increase of 3.7 ug/m³ in PM_{2.5}
25 would not have an adverse health effect. Certainly 3.7 ug/m³ of PM_{2.5} is low in
26 itself. However, given the revised application materials, it appears to me that the
27 PM_{2.5} levels in the vicinity of the plant, those cited for "Abbotsford" for
28 example, are reaching between 24 and 32 ug/m³ (depending on the year). If we
29 use the 25 ug/m³ guideline selected by the PSCAA ad hoc committee (as
30 discussed in my prior testimony before the Council) those levels of PM_{2.5} would
31 rise to around 27.7 to 35.7 ug/m³ with the addition of the plant. The 35.7 level
32 would also exceed the 30 ug/m³ 24h. Canada air quality standard. Moreover, as
33 increased exposures to PM_{2.5} have been shown to carry adverse health impacts, it
34 is illogical to be dismissive of the potential threat. It is similarly illogical to be
35 dismissive of potential adverse health impacts in light of the growing recognition
36 that global warming will result in increases in both ozone and PM air pollution.
37
38

39 END OF TESTIMONY
40
41